

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed May 6, 2003, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 1, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krainiak. Moreover, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krainiak in view of Knab. And claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendment, claims 1, 8, and 10-12 have been cancelled without prejudice and new claims 13-17 have been added. No new matter has been added.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *MPEP 2131*. Moreover, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *MPEP 2143.03*. New claim 13 requires an emitting unit for providing a stream of airflow, a receiving means in facing relation to the emitting unit and the stream of airflow, and the receiving means comprising a work surface having a suction grill. Neither Krainiak nor Knab, taken individually or in combination, teaches these limitation as now required by claim 13. More specifically, the prior does not teach or suggest a receiving means comprising a work surface having a suction

grill. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 14-17 are dependent from claim 13 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 13.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the newly added claims. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed May 6, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 13-17 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, examination and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dennison, Schultz &  
Dougherty

By: 

Amir H. Behnia  
Reg. No. 50,215  
(703) 412-1155 Ext. 16